

Discussion paper on the Use of LCRI 1.11a for electronic reproductions

Prepared by Jean Hiron and Les Hawkins for discussion at the May 2002 CONSER Operations meeting.

Background

CONSER decided last May not to apply LCRI 1.11a to serials for a number of reasons that emerged from discussions during that time. Opinions were split, however, with some favoring the approach. The issue was brought up for reconsideration in 2002 and many people were in favor of applying the RI to certain situations.

Followings is a draft for inclusion in Module 31, arguments for and against use of the RI, and questions for discussion.

Excerpt for inclusion in Module 31 (if CONSER applies the RI) (prepared by Les Hawkins)

When cataloging digitized print serials, making distinctions between simultaneous "versions" and "reproductions" is sometimes difficult. In other formats, such as microforms, a reproduction is treated differently than a simultaneous version. Simultaneous versions are cataloged based on the characteristics of each version. An item treated as a reproduction contains a description based on the original item whether print or other format. Information about the reproduction is given in a note (e.g. reproduction format, place and name of the reproducing agency, etc.) Until recently, CONSER has not made a distinction between digital reproductions and simultaneous versions. It has treated all electronic versions of print format serials as simultaneous versions and based the description on the version itself. The practices outlined below will allow catalogers to determine whether a reproduction is a secondary manifestation and can be treated as a reproduction. LC expanded LCRI 1.11A in May 2000 to expedite the processing of NetLibrary titles by cloning records for the print versions and adding information about the reproduction in just a few fields.

CONSER practice allows members to follow this rule interpretation where it is clear that a secondary body is scanning or otherwise reproducing a dead serial which has no possibility of being simultaneously reproduced. Most titles of this type will be from scanning projects.

The LCRI defines a reproduction as a manifestation which:

- Replicates an item or another manifestation
- Is intended to function as a substitute
- May be in a different physical format with different physical characteristics
- Is produced using a mechanical rather than intellectual process
- Is produced because of the original's limited availability, remote location, poor condition, high cost, or restricted utility

In case of doubt:

“Cataloger judgment will be required to distinguish electronic reproductions from electronic republications or simultaneous publication in analog and digital form...in cases of doubt, do not consider the electronic manifestation to be a reproduction.”

The judgment call requires the cataloger to make the distinction between republication or simultaneous publication and reproduction. Generally, the cataloger will need to know in what form the item originally appeared. For current, commercially published titles, it is often difficult to know whether electronic or print is the “original” format and therefore current publications are considered simultaneous versions.

Applying LCRI 1.11a

As with microform cataloging, use the print version record as the basis for the electronic reproduction record. Transcribe the bibliographic data appropriate to the original work being reproduced in the following areas:

title and statement of responsibility
 edition
 material (or type of publication) specific details
 publication, distribution, etc.
 physical description
 series

[The following chart may be placed in the CEG rather than Module 31 of the CCM]

Field	Data
Form of item	s
Form of original	#
007	Example: <i>007 c \$b r \$d c \$e n</i>
130	<i>Title of serial (Online)*</i>
245 \$h [GMD]	electronic resource
533	<div> <div>\$a</div> <div>\$m</div> <div>\$b and \$c</div> <div>\$d</div> <div>\$f</div> <div>\$n</div> </div> <div> <i>-reproduction format**</i> <i>– sequential designation of issues reproduced</i> <i>–place and name of the reproduction agency</i> <i>–date of the reproduction</i> <i>–series statement of the reproduction (if applicable)</i> <i>–notes relating to the reproduction</i> </div>
Other notes pertaining to the reproduction	Mode of access, file characteristics (optional) or system requirements (optional)
Online access information	856 \$u

* This will require a revision of LCRI 25.5B.

*In 533, the wording LC is using in \$a (reproduction format) is *Electronic reproduction* rather than the SMD because there is no SMD for remote-access resources.

Other notes are generally limited to Mode of access and possibly File characteristics and/or System requirements if either is unusual.

Arguments for and against the use of LCRI 25.5B for serials

For (based on comments from CONSER in 2001 and 2002)

- There are scanning projects underway for which this RI would be useful
- Being able to make use of existing records is a big plus
- Making the distinction between reproduction and non-reproduction is not that difficult (according to some), particularly when you can see the wrinkles and the coffee stains!
- Will allow for a fast means of producing records

Against (based on comments from MIT in 2001)

- A CONSER policy that limits the RI to dead titles will be an interpretation of an interpretation and will make conformity of practice difficult
- The LCRI is flawed, and thus the CONSER application of it, because the cataloger must determine whether the manifestation is intended to be a substitute and also to distinguish between reproduction and republication
- The records for dead serials that will be cloned will include pre-AACR2 and latest entry
- What is alive today may be dead tomorrow! Is this a useful criteria?
- Will this cause even more inconsistency with CONSER agencies, such as NLC, which uses AACR2 as written?
- Might we treat a serial that has been reproduced by JSTOR in one way and the later issues made available by Project Muse another?

Questions for discussion

1. Can we develop CONSER guidelines that will make it easy to determine when to apply?
2. Are the situations clear? Are there enough clearly dead serials currently being scanned (e.g., American Periodical series) that warrant this approach?
3. Would the end result be confusing or clear enough to patrons? In either case, the record would contain a 130 (what about pre-AA2 though?), 245 GMD, and 856. It's what is in between that would differ.
4. How would this fit into a long term FRBR approach to displays?